

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed September 21, 2009, claims 1 – 14 were rejected. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, and 4 – 13, canceled claims 3 and 14, and added new claims 15 – 20. Applicants submit herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims, the added claims, the RCE, and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, the title of the invention was amended to correct a spelling error.

Objections to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to for being more than 150 words. Furthermore, the abstract was objected to for containing legal phraseology such as “said” and because “(r: quest profile)” at line 17 was not clear. Appropriate corrections have been made and Applicants respectfully request the objection to be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Biessener et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0088513, hereinafter Biessener). Additionally, claims 6, 7, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biessener in view of Jameson (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0054864). However, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable over Biessener and Jameson for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out that the memory device includes “a plurality of interfaces” and to particularly point out that the interfaces “are functional units each providing specific access characteristics by allocating a set of request profiles to each interface.” Support for the amendments can be found in

Applicants' specification at, for example, paragraphs [0031], [0032], [0050], [0051], and [0085] and Figure 3 (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0174056 A1).

Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose "a plurality of interfaces" and that the interfaces "are functional units each providing specific access characteristics by allocating a set of request profiles to each interface" as recited in amended claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2 and 4 – 13

Claims 2 and 4 – 13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2 and 4 – 13 are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2 and 4 – 13 may be allowable for further reasons.

New Claims 15 – 18

New claims 15 – 18 are supported in Applicants' specification at, for example, paragraphs [0071] – [0076] and Figure 1 (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0174056 A1).

Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose a memory device as specifically recited in claims 15 – 18. For example, Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose a memory cell array, a word-select unit, and a section-select unit. Additionally, Applicants assert that although Biessener discloses a partition table having a column that indicates whether a portion of memory is "bootable," "non-bootable," or "read-only," (see Biessener Fig. 5 and paragraph [0071]) Applicants assert that partition table does not include access flags "whose state indicates whether a corresponding access request is allowed to access the memory or not allowed to access the memory" as recited in new claim 15.

With respect to claim 16, Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose "a set of access flags, one access flag for each row address, such that each access flag governs the access to one row of the memory cell array."

With respect to claim 17, Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose that the flags are "fast read-out state registers."

With respect to claim 18, Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose that "the access control unit operates in a data path to admit or reject a flow of data to or from

the memory cell array depending on the state of the corresponding access flag it receives from the profile storage unit.”

With respect to claim 19, Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose “a memory mapped interface and an I/O mapped interface connected to provide access to the memory cell array.”

With respect to claim 20, Applicants assert that Biessener does not disclose that pins of the memory device are shared by the memory mapped and I/O mapped interfaces.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amended claims, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Petition is hereby made under 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the time for response to the Office Action of 12/21/2009, to and through 1/21/2010, comprising an extension of the shortened statutory period of one month.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: January 21, 2010

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111